

preparedness and to encourage cities and municipalities, counties, parishes, and Indian tribes to work together to meet the threats that are out there.

We currently require States to submit 3-year plans to the Department of Homeland Security and it is unrealistic to expect States to effectively plan ahead without providing some certainty on the funding they should expect to receive.

This amendment also creates new audit provisions, requires mandatory reporting, coordination among grant programs at different Federal agencies, and that individual expenditures be tied to achieving nationally established essential capabilities. So we are tying funding to meeting needs that are out there, tying funding to maximizing coordination, tying funding to achieving certain levels of preparedness. Tying spending to achieving national preparedness goals and holding States accountable to how funds are spent will prevent wasteful expenditures on other items that are not needed. Homeland security funding is not simply about getting more equipment in a Federal agency; it is not a Christmas tree; it is meeting needs. What we have in this amendment is to measure and make sure spending is tied to meeting the levels of preparedness and effectiveness. Requiring coordination among different Federal grant programs for first responders will prevent recipients from purchasing duplicative or incompatible equipment or training. The bottom line is that homeland security dollars will be spent more wisely and effectively, and that is what we should be doing.

This amendment is a great step forward in terms of contributing funds on a regional basis and ensuring that communities have the tools they need to work together to provide greater security for their residents. I look forward to supporting this amendment today and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN that would provide for homeland security grant coordination and simplification. I wish to thank them both for working with me and the other Members of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs to include a provision in their amendment that is very important to Indian Country.

This amendment is based on S. 21, the Homeland Security Grant Enhancement Act, a bill that was reported out of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee favorably and of which I am an original cosponsor. S. 21 recognizes that no State is immune to terrorist attack by requiring that each State receive at minimum .55 percent of appropriated funding. This is important to States like Hawaii that are smaller in population, but still have critical assets that need to be protected.

The Collins-Lieberman amendment also ensures that Indian tribes have access to homeland security funding. With more than 50 million acres of land comprising Indian Country, which includes dams, hydroelectric facilities, nuclear power generating plants, oil and gas pipelines, transportation corridors of railroad and highway systems, and communications towers, tribal governments need to have funds to protect and respond to threats of terrorism. Although the Homeland Security Act of 2002 included tribal governments in the definition of "local governments," this distinction has not guaranteed that tribal governments are consulted or involved in the protection of the United States. Nor does the act ensure that Indian Country will receive critical information regarding potential terrorist threats, and more importantly, the act does not give tribal governments the authority to detain potential terrorists who are found in Indian Country.

While the amendment does not fully address the homeland security problems that some tribal governments are experiencing, it is a bipartisan compromise that at the very least will ensure that Indian tribes with critical homeland security needs will be able to apply directly to the Department of Homeland Security for risk-based homeland security grants.

I am pleased that my colleagues recognize that tribes should have the same access to homeland security funding as the rest of the country. This is an important first step for Indian Country to address homeland security issues.

Again, I thank Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN for their work on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, last Thursday, a series of four explosions struck the heart of London during the morning rush hour. At least 49 innocent victims were killed and 700 others were injured. A previously unknown group called the "secret group of al-Qaida's jihad" in Europe claimed responsibility in the name of al-Qaida for the attacks.

On behalf of the U.S. Senate and the American people, we express our heartfelt condolences to the victims, their families, and to the British people, our cousins across the Atlantic. We share

in your grief and in your determination to hunt down the criminals who carried out this despicable act. We consider the attack last week on British soil an attack on the civilized world. We stand with the British people just as they have long stood with us.

For nearly two centuries, the United States and the United Kingdom have enjoyed a special relationship. We speak the same language. We share a heritage of freedom and our economies are inexorably intertwined. Our militaries, our intelligence services, our great corporations, and our distinguished universities share deep relationships. Today, our forces fight side by side in Iraq and Afghanistan, sharing the sacrifices and the victories.

As we learned on 9/11, our enemies are coldblooded killers who deliberately target innocent victims—women and men on their way to work, schoolchildren starting the new school year, and vacationers at the beach.

Our enemies pervert religion. They despise freedom. They seek to overthrow regimes and dominate the world. But as they learned on 9/11, America, the United Kingdom, and the free people of the world will not stand by. We are taking the fight to their soil, to their caves, to their hideouts. We are disrupting their terror cells and financing operations. We are strengthening our homeland defenses and sharing information among intelligence agencies and nations.

Brave men and women are working every day to thwart the enemy, to find him and bring him to justice. But as President Bush observed today, the terrorists need to be right only once. Free nations tend to be right 100 percent of the time. They need to be. And the best way to defeat the enemy is to stay on the offense.

We will call upon the international community to renew and strengthen its efforts to defeat the terrorists, dismantle their networks, and to drain the swamps of injustice, oppression, poverty, and extremism that feed their hateful ideology.

In the war on terror, we will not stop. We will not waiver. We will stand united against the enemies of freedom. And whatever it takes, wherever it takes us, we will win.

Mr. President, under the previous agreement, we will now have a moment of silence in memory of those whose lives were lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will recognize 1 minute of silence.

(The Senate observed a moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now consider S. Res. 193. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 193) expressing sympathy for the people of the United Kingdom in the aftermath of the deadly terrorist attacks on London on July 7, 2005.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mrs. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Akaka	Dole	Lieberman
Allard	Domenici	Lugar
Allen	Dorgan	McConnell
Bennett	Durbin	Murray
Biden	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Enzi	Reed
Bond	Feingold	Reid
Brownback	Feinstein	Roberts
Bunning	Frist	Rockefeller
Burns	Graham	Salazar
Burr	Grassley	Santorum
Byrd	Gregg	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hagel	Schumer
Carper	Harkin	Shelby
Chafee	Hatch	Snowe
Clinton	Inouye	Specter
Coburn	Isakson	Stabenow
Coleman	Jeffords	Stevens
Collins	Johnson	Sununu
Conrad	Kennedy	Talent
Corzine	Kerry	Vitter
Craig	Kohl	Voinovich
Crapo	Kyl	Warner
DeMint	Lautenberg	Wyden
DeWine	Leahy	
Dodd	Levin	

NOT VOTING—24

Alexander	Hutchison	Murkowski
Baucus	Inhofe	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Landrieu	Obama
Boxer	Lincoln	Pryor
Chambliss	Lott	Sessions
Cochran	Martinez	Smith
Cornyn	McCain	Thomas
Dayton	Mikulski	Thune

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 193

Whereas the United States and a broad international coalition have been engaged in a Global War on Terrorism since the terrorist attacks in Washington, D.C., New York, and Pennsylvania that occurred on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the people and Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom enjoy a deep and enduring friendship undergirded by shared history, language, and values;

Whereas the United Kingdom has been a strong and steadfast ally to the United States through two World Wars, the Cold War, the Gulf War, and the Global War on Terrorism, including the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas terrorists have planned and conducted attacks around the world during the four years after the Global War on Terrorism began in 2001, most notably the bombing of a night club on the Indonesian island of Bali on October 12, 2002 that killed 202 people and injured an additional 209, the bombings of two synagogues and the British Embassy in Istanbul, Turkey in November 2003, in which 56 people were killed and over 450 injured, and the bombing of the train system in Madrid, Spain on March 11, 2004 that killed more than 190 people and injured approximately 1,500;

Whereas on July 7, 2005, a series of four explosions struck the London public transportation system during the morning rush hour, killing at least 49 innocent civilians and injuring approximately 700 others;

Whereas a previously unknown terrorist group claimed responsibility for the attacks in the name of al Qaeda;

Whereas the terrorist attacks in London coincided with the opening of the G-8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, a Summit committed to bringing help and hope to the poorest countries of the world;

Whereas President Bush immediately condemned the terrorist attacks and extended the "heartfelt condolences" of the people of the United States to the people of the United Kingdom;

Whereas Prime Minister Tony Blair vowed, on behalf of the United Kingdom and the world leaders attending the G-8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, to remain steadfast and strong in the fight against terrorism, stating, "All of our countries have suffered from the impact of terrorism. Those responsible have no respect for human life. We are united in our resolve to confront and defeat this terrorism that is not an attack on one nation, but all nations and on civilized people everywhere. . . . It's important . . . that those engaged in terrorism realize that our determination to defend our values and our way of life is greater than their determination to cause death and destruction to innocent people in a desire to impose extremism on the world", and declared, "We shall prevail, and [the terrorists] shall not";

Whereas the North Atlantic Council, the governing body of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, after meeting in an extraordinary session, reaffirmed the determination

of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to combat the scourge of terrorism and defend the values of freedom, tolerance, and democracy using all available means;

Whereas world leaders attending the G-8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland expressed condolences to the people of the United Kingdom and issued a joint statement to "condemn utterly these barbaric attacks"; and

Whereas Prime Minister Tony Blair, speaking on behalf of the world leaders attending the G-8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, declared, "We are united in the resolve" to defeat terrorism, which is "not an attack on one nation, but on all nations": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses deepest sympathies and condolences to the people of the United Kingdom and the victims and their families for the heinous terrorist attacks that occurred in London on July 7, 2005;

(2) condemns these barbaric and unwarranted attacks on the innocent people of London;

(3) expresses strong and continued solidarity with the people of the United Kingdom and pledges to remain shoulder-to-shoulder with the people of the United Kingdom to bring the terrorists responsible for these brutal attacks to justice; and

(4) calls upon the international community to renew and strengthen efforts to—

(A) defeat terrorists by dismantling terrorist networks and exposing the violent and nihilistic ideology of terrorism;

(B) increase international cooperation to advance personal and religious freedoms, ethnic and racial tolerance, political liberty and pluralism, and economic prosperity; and

(C) combat the social injustice, oppression, poverty, and extremism that breeds terrorism.

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, on the way from California to Washington this morning, my plane had engine trouble, and I had to return to California. As a result, I was not able to make the vote on the resolution condemning the terrorist bombings in London last week and expressing sympathy for the people of the United Kingdom.

Had I been present, I would certainly have voted for the resolution. I hope that it serves to strengthen our resolve to go after the terrorists and to do everything we can to protect the people of the United States, particularly by doing more to secure our rail and transit systems.●

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, on Monday, July 11, 2005, I testified before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission regional hearing in San Antonio, TX, regarding Department of Defense recommended changes to military installations in Arkansas and Texas. Therefore, I was absent during vote No. 173 on the Senate Resolution condemning the terrorist attacks in London on July 7 and expressing sympathy for the victims, their families and the people of the United Kingdom.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea in support of this resolution.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, at this point, just to inform the membership, what is going to happen is Senator FEINSTEIN is going to introduce an amendment, and then Senator ISAKSON is going to take time to speak to his amendment.

Tomorrow morning, we hope to reach an agreement where Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment will be debated along with the amendment of Senator COLLINS for up to 3 hours evenly divided, and then we will have votes on those two amendments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the subcommittee. I will very shortly propose an amendment which will stand next to Senator COLLINS's amendment.

The purpose of my amendment is simple. It provides that the Secretary of Homeland Security will ensure that Homeland Security grants are allocated based on the assessment of threat, vulnerability, and consequence to the maximum extent practicable.

This amendment dovetails S. 1013 which Senator CORNYN and I submitted earlier. Cosponsors are Senators LAUTENBERG, BOXER, HUTCHISON, KERRY, MARTINEZ, SCHUMER, NELSON of Florida, CLINTON, CORZINE, KENNEDY, and DODD.

AMENDMENT NO. 1215 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1142

(Purpose: To improve the allocation of grants through the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes)

I send this amendment to the desk and ask it be set aside until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], for herself and Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 1215 to amendment No. 1142.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside and my amendment be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1070

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. ISAKSON] proposes an amendment numbered 1070.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate that inadequacies in border protection and alien and drug smugglers' methods, routes, and modes of transportation are potential vulnerabilities that can be exploited by terrorists to illegally smuggle terrorists and their weapons into the United States, surveillance of the entire border between the United States and Mexico is essential to protect the United States, and the Mexican Government must commit to addressing its own domestic border security policies, which contribute to the present inadequacies in our Nation's homeland security)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BORDER SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illegal alien population has risen from 3,200,000 in 1986 to 10,300,000 in 2004.

(2) In fiscal year 2001, United States Border Patrol agents apprehended almost 1,200,000 persons for illegally entering the United States.

(3) Senate Report 109–083 states, “there are an estimated 11,000,000 illegal aliens in the United States, including more than 400,000 individuals who have absconded, walking away with impunity from Orders of Deportation and Removal”.

(4) Between 1,000 and 3,000 special interest aliens from countries with an active terrorist presence enter the United States each year.

(5) Of the 1,200,000 illegal aliens apprehended on the border between the United States and Mexico, 643 were from countries with known terrorism ties, including Syria, Iran, and Libya.

(6) Senate Report 109–083 states, “officials of the Department of Homeland Security have conceded the United States does not have operational control of its borders”, including areas along the 1,989-mile southwest border between the United States and Mexico.

(7) The daily attempts to cross the border by thousands of illegal aliens from countries around the globe continue to present a threat to United States national security.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) this Nation cannot thoroughly address the security of the United States without recognizing the reality of terrorists taking advantage of inadequacies in border security along the border between the United States and Mexico;

(2) every effort should be made to increase the technology and efficiency in preventing these individuals from entering the United States across the Mexican border;

(3) the Mexican Government has an obligation to secure its side of the border between the United States and Mexico; and

(4) the Mexican Government must commit to addressing inadequacies in its own domestic and border security policies, which are contributing to the present dilemma in border security.

Mr. ISAKSON. I express my appreciation to the subcommittee chairman, Senator GREGG of New Hampshire. It is

my understanding from the chairman that it has been agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe the Senator can ask unanimous consent for approval.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1070) was agreed to.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, the amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill dealing with border security. I commend the subcommittee chairman on the tremendous investment this bill makes in homeland security and in border security to the United States of America.

A few months ago when I made one of the first speeches in the Senate with regard to the floor supplemental, I talked a little bit about REAL ID and what is the largest single domestic issue in the United States today, illegal immigration.

In that particular speech I made a note that I love our system of immigration, love the fact you can come to this country and become a citizen—I am a second-generation American myself—but we have been flooded as a nation over the past decade by a tremendous influx of those who have come illegally, many over the border of the south, although obviously to the north as well.

This goes a long way toward providing the funding to Customs and to Immigration to begin enforcing laws on the books, making it tougher to come into the United States the wrong way and hopefully making it easier to come to the United States the right way, the legal way.

We need a partner on our southern border. The sense-of-the-Senate amendment is very simple. It simply asks the Government of Mexico to assist in helping to secure the border between the United States and Mexico to ensure that those who immigrate into this country are coming in consistent with the laws of the United States of America.

We have a great trading partner to the south. We have a great neighbor to the south. We have a country that shares many common interests. We have a country that we enjoy being our neighbor. We also would like for them to be our partner in seeing to it that the border we share is secure so that those who are crossing are crossing legally and consistent with the laws of that nation.

I thank the subcommittee chairman for his cooperation. I thank the Senate for agreeing to this amendment. I am pleased we can express this sense of the Senate that the common interest of

both countries is in the best interests of America when it comes to the border security between ourselves and the country of Mexico.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the following Senators be added as cosponsors of the Collins-Lieberman amendment No. 1142: Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator HARKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. This is in addition to the cosponsors previously cited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the fiscal year 2006 Homeland Security appropriations bill.

Protecting the security of our people and our homeland is the most important responsibility that any Member of this body possesses. It is, therefore, our solemn obligation to review this bill carefully and make certain it adequately addresses our Nation's vulnerabilities.

The question should be, Have we done all that we can do to make America safe? Now, obviously, none of us can look into the minds, the perverted minds of the terrorists and know everything they might do to harm us or people around the world, as we saw again in London last week. But I think we do have an obligation to do all we can. Does that mean even after we do it there will never be an attack? Of course not. But we have to try, to the best of our human ability, to protect our citizens and make our Nation safe by deterring, detecting, and preventing terrorist attacks.

I believe—and I am sure many of my colleagues would agree—that to make America truly safe we need to carefully allocate our homeland security resources. We need to make sure the money we appropriate in Congress gets to where it is most needed; that the American cities, States and places that are under the greatest threat, that are most vulnerable, receive the funding they need to be protected.

I have advocated for threat-based allocation of homeland security funds for several years now. Last year, the 9/11 Commission made a very specific recommendation. It urged Congress to base Federal funding for emergency preparedness solely—solely—on risks and vulnerabilities.

Over the last 4 years, the Department of Homeland Security and its agencies have provided \$11.3 billion to State and local governments to prevent, prepare for, and respond to acts of terrorism. Additionally, \$3.2 billion in grants and other assistance provided by other Federal agencies has also gone to State and local responders to take on the terrorist threat.

Unfortunately, nearly half of this \$14.5 billion has been allocated according to congressionally mandated for-

mulas that bear little relation to need, risk, vulnerability, or threat.

Last September, when the Senate took up consideration of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, I offered an amendment to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to allocate formula-based grants to State and local governments based on an assessment of threats and vulnerabilities, in accordance with the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

Although the amendment was tabled, I am thankful, as are I am sure millions of my fellow Americans who live in high-threat communities, that the President has finally heard our concerns. He proposed, in the fiscal year 2006 budget, a restructuring of \$2.6 billion in grants for States, urban areas, and infrastructure protection. Under the President's proposal, DHS, the Department of Homeland Security, will target grants to fill critical gaps in State and local terrorism prevention and preparedness capabilities, taking into consideration threats and vulnerabilities.

While I am not completely satisfied with the formula—of course I could not be, representing New York, which remains, by all the intelligence we are privy to, the No. 1 target of the terrorists in our country—I am pleased by the recognition of the President and Secretary Chertoff that we are now called upon to look at threat-based funding. That is indeed welcome news.

While this bill we are considering makes important steps toward securing our homeland, there are certainly some deficiencies that we cannot afford to ignore. Last week's tragic events in London highlighted one of our Nation's most glaring homeland security deficiencies—the vulnerability of our rail and transit systems.

We have seen these senseless, evil terrorist attacks in Japan, Russia, Spain, and now England. These attacks, like the one that struck our own country on 9/11, hit when innocent people were going about their everyday lives. All of these cowardly acts were not merely attacks on individuals but an attack on a way of life.

These attacks on the subway and transit systems around the world are a clear signal to this Congress that we have to fill this glaring hole in our national security budget.

Now, our resolve to stand against these acts of terrorism will not waiver. But courage and determination is not enough. We must also commit, with equal force, to developing a comprehensive plan and allocating adequate resources to guard against similar attacks in our own cities and States.

I know there are some who argue against increasing the funding for homeland security because they say: Well, we can't possibly guard against every risk and vulnerability. I read a comment by one think tank pundit who said: We can't childproof our Na-

Well, childproofing a home when a new baby arrives is something I take very seriously. I think most parents do as well. We go out and we buy those little plugs to put into outlets. We move to a higher shelf household cleaners and poisons. We go out and maybe buy one of those little gates to put at the top and bottom of stairs. We obviously take steps to childproof our homes.

Starting in the 1970s, responsible parents got some help from the Federal Government, which, looking at the evidence, determined that a lot of children were getting into the prescription pills of their parents and suffering severe injury, even death. So along came the childproof top that made it very difficult for little hands to open those dangerous pill bottles. And other steps were taken so that responsible parents could have some control over the circumstances in their homes and in their communities that their children would face.

Does that mean every risk facing every child was eliminated? Of course not. But we saved a lot of lives. We protected a lot of children. We provided a lot of peace of mind to many mothers and fathers.

So when somebody in a kind of off-hand, critical way says, "What do these people expect when they call for more money for rail and transit security or for border security or for chemical plant security? They are trying to childproof the Nation," I view that as an ignorant insult. Of course we are trying to protect our Nation. That is our highest obligation. We know we cannot protect against everything, but we have to do all we can to make sure every community is as protected as we can make it.

We know from every expert who has looked at rail and transit security that we are woefully underfunding it. In fact, based on the research and analysis I have seen, it would take approximately \$7 billion to protect across this country the tens of millions of people who use our mass transit systems—our subways, our buses, our trains, our ferries—every single day to get back and forth to work, to go about their daily lives.

We know millions of Americans use this because they have to. It is convenient. It is inexpensive. It fills their needs. In New York, we have millions and millions of New Yorkers who ride the bus and the subway and the ferries and the trains every single day. So when the tragedy struck in London, it was again a tragic wakeup call for our own country.

I know we cannot provide all the funding that many of us believe is necessary to take the steps required to protect our transit systems. But we certainly must do more than the \$100 million currently in the Senate bill. I am grateful the Senate majority leader has recognized the bill's reduction from last year's \$150 million to \$100 million was a step in the wrong direction and that at a minimum we need to restore the \$50 million that was cut.

If we look at how much money has been spent on airline security, we find it totals \$18 billion. We all know that following the attacks of 9/11, spending that money on airline security was absolutely necessary. Some of it went a little overboard—people who have no profile of fitting any kind of terrorist identity being strip-searched or being stopped or people going through all the security—but we spent that money because we knew we had to deter those people who might wish us ill by using our air against us.

We simply cannot continue to short-change rail and transit security. More people are riding our transit systems than ride our airplanes and commercial aviation.

Last October, the Senate passed the Rail Security Act of 2004. The bill was introduced by Senator MCCAIN, and I was proud to be an original cosponsor. That bill would have authorized Amtrak and New York to receive over \$570 million to upgrade the six tunnels for better ventilation, electrical and fire safety technology upgrades, emergency communications and lighting systems, and emergency access and egress for passengers.

A couple of years ago I stood right in this spot with pictures of what the tunnels in New York look like. We now know one of the explosions in London took place in Kings Cross. The rescue workers have not even been able to get there yet. They are not even sure they have recovered all of the bodies.

We will learn from this horrible tragedy, and we will be able to do an even better job in what we need to do to protect tunnels and bridges and other essential infrastructure for our rail and transit systems. But I am bewildered because the \$150 million we appropriated last year for rail and transit security has not yet been fully distributed by the Department of Homeland Security to the cities and the States that need it. Instead of being put to work on behalf of improved safety in our rail and transit systems, it is sitting on the ledgers of the Department of Homeland Security.

We need to spend that money, and we need to be smart about how we spend it. But the plans that city and State transit systems have developed can't be implemented if the Federal Government doesn't do its part.

I hope, as we consider the Homeland Security appropriations bill this week, we will support the amendments that increase funding for securing our Nation's rail and transit systems. I hope we will do so because it is the right thing to do and because the bombings last Thursday in London were such a tragic reminder of what we still need to do to protect our own homeland from senseless and barbaric actions of extremists.

I am proud to join Senators SHELBY, SARBANES, INOUE, REED, and other colleagues in an amendment to add over \$1.3 billion in additional rail and transit security grants. I am abso-

lutely confident that our Nation is up to the task of securing our mass transit systems. I am absolutely confident that this body is capable of dedicating the resources necessary to get this essential job done. I hope this week proves that we are ready, we are willing, and we are able to do everything possible to protect our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to add a comment or two to our colleague from New York. I believe in the fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill, which is currently in effect, there was about \$150 million that could be used for improving transit and rail security. I believe, as of last week, none of that money had been allocated. I hope that is not true, but that is what I have been briefed by my staff. None of that \$150 million has been allocated. One has to wonder what it takes. I fear that it may take some tragedy to really get our attention, the attention of the executive branch to begin allocating the money and putting it where it can do the most good most promptly.

As I understand it, the administration has asked for no appropriation in their budget proposal for fiscal 2006 for rail security and transit security. The committee has put in \$100 million for that purpose, and I believe the committee has agreed to raise it to the current level of appropriation of \$150 million. But if the administration is not going to spend the money, what good does it do for us to allocate. It is very disappointing. I hope it is not true, but I am afraid it probably is.

I thank my colleague for bringing this to our attention and join her in saying we can do a lot better and we have to.

Some time tomorrow, we are going to have the opportunity to vote on several options for allocating aid to first responders in our 50 States, firefighters, police, paramedics, and others who are first on the scene. When tragedy strikes and that tragedy happens to be a strike launched by terrorists, they will be the first to be there, whether it is Delaware, Missouri, New York, or any other State.

I rise to express my strong support for an amendment that is going to be offered tomorrow by Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN. That amendment seeks to streamline the system for distributing first responder aid to States, tries to make the system more fair, and seeks to ensure that every State, large or small, receives the funding that may be needed to respond to terrorist attacks and to other disasters.

Senator COLLINS and I have been working with Senator LIEBERMAN and other members of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on this issue for some time. In fact, Senator COLLINS and I first introduced legislation on this topic more than 2 years ago. That original bill came after a series of hearings we held

in our committee, highlighting the fact that the way we help States prepare for disasters simply makes little sense. The application process is lengthy and confusing. More importantly, the funding formula simply isn't getting money to those who need it the most.

States, counties, cities, and first responders all told us in one voice that we need to do something about it. Much of what Senator COLLINS and I and our colleagues did in that initial legislation a couple years ago to respond to the concerns is reflected in the amendment that will be offered tomorrow by Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN.

That amendment mirrors in many respects the bill that Senator COLLINS and I introduced 2 years ago. For example, the amendment streamlines the grant application process. It creates a one-stop shop within the Department of Homeland Security where State officials and others can seek grant information. It also ensures that funds are distributed as quickly as possible and requires States to go through a planning process that would include both localities and first responders.

In addition, we take steps in this amendment to give States more flexibility in spending their first responder aid. Not every State is the same. Missouri's needs may be different than Delaware's. This amendment, as with our earlier bill, gives States the ability to ask for a waiver from the Department. If they want to use a little more money for training or equipment or exercises or planning, they can go to the Department and ask for a waiver to do so. One size does not fit all. This amendment, such as our earlier bill, acknowledges that.

Funding formulas are akin to what they used to say about beauty. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. The beauty of a funding formula is oftentimes in the eye of the particular State that is eyeing the formula. I believe we have gone a long way toward addressing the concerns that some of our colleagues from more populous States have raised over the years. There were concerns among a number of Senators, both on and off the Homeland Security Committee, that the current program in our original legislation directed too much aid to smaller States, to less populated States, at the expense of larger States or more populated States and high-threat urban areas. I believe we have addressed those concerns.

A version of this amendment that was added by a unanimous vote to the intelligence reform bill last year provide additional allocations to the dozen or so largest States in the country. It also allowed the Secretary of Homeland Security to distribute a portion of the funding made available for State grants directly to the most at-risk urban areas. We go even further this year, further than some of the supporters of our original legislation might like to have gone. In an effort to shift even more funding to those parts

of the country most at risk, Senator COLLINS, Senator LIEBERMAN, and the rest of us who support their amendment have negotiated a new funding formula that actually reduces the baseline allocation or the so-called small State minimum guaranteed to every State.

Currently in the bill, it is 0.75-percent minimum for every State. The amendment that will be offered tomorrow by Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN and myself and others would take that minimum down to 0.55 percent. We have also added language in this amendment that gives the Secretary the discretion to allocate up to half of the available funds to big cities. In total, these efforts have resulted in what I think is a balanced formula that I am told allocates about twice as much aid on risk as we did in last year's appropriations bill.

There will be some who will argue that the baseline allocation in this amendment should be even smaller or that it should not exist at all. I respond to that argument by simply pointing out that my own home State of Delaware may be small. We may have a small population—about 800,000 people, in fact. That is more than about six States that are, frankly, bigger than us in size have. But Delaware is home to significant critical infrastructure such as chemical facilities, oil refineries, and one of the most important ports in the country, and those could be unfortunately on a terrorist target list.

Right across the Delaware River, about 15 miles from my home, are two nuclear powerplants. Up and down the northeast corridor we have I-95 carrying, each day, hundreds of thousands of cars, trucks and vans, including trucks carrying some dangerous material. We have the northeast rail corridor through which some of our largest freight railroads pass, again carrying all kinds of cargo, goods, including some which are hazardous, potentially a target to terrorists. We have the Delaware River, the Delaware Bay. Every day dozens of ships go up and down the Delaware River, any number of which carry cargo that could be considered hazardous.

My staff and I have talked to any number of public safety officials in Delaware. Here is what they tell us. They tell us that they are not getting the resources they need to enable them to respond to incidents that the Department of Homeland Security itself has told us have a real possibility of happening in our State. I am sure many of my colleagues from States large and small could share similar stories with us, and they probably will during the course of this debate. That is one reason why we need to approve this amendment.

I urge all of our colleagues to support this compromise amendment. It does the best job of any proposal that I have seen at getting the most at-risk parts of our country the first responder aid

that they need without arbitrarily shortchanging smaller States like Delaware that may be small in size but the risk profile belies the modest size in population.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 1129

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to address the VA health care system's funding crisis. I thank my colleague, the Democratic leader, Senator REID, for his determination to ensure that \$1.5 billion is provided as soon as possible. At this point, it is widely known that VA is facing a tremendous funding shortfall this year. What we need to do now is ensure that VA gets these funds as expeditiously as possible.

I am glad the administration has admitted that there is a shortfall. But I point out that VA officials have proven themselves to be an unreliable source of information. And judging by the supplemental sent forward by the President, they are less than generous, and frankly, less than accurate. The \$975 million now proposed by the administration—and carried forward by the House—falls short of addressing all of VA's problems.

You need only look at the administration's own estimate for new costs associated with returning service members. VA now believes that 103,000 more veterans will be treated this year. The cost of treating this kind of patient is \$5,437 a year, as documented by VA data. Yet, the administration wants to now convince us that, in fact, the cost of treating a patient is less than half of this amount. Again, using VA data, the cost of caring for an additional 103,000 returning veterans is \$560 million and not the \$273 million suggested by the administration. Other key programs such as readjustment counseling and dental care were also not sufficiently covered by the House in the VA supplemental.

It is imperative that we make sure the funds we provide now are truly sufficient, so we do not face this situation again. It is simply not right to use out-of-date equipment to treat veterans or force them to wait months for care.

The Senate has already spoken in a very bipartisan manner on this issue. We are all very proud of our effort to arrive at the \$1.5 billion figure previously agreed to before the July Fourth recess. Given the House's work to provide less than the full amount needed, it is clear that we have more work to do for this year.

The battle for next year's funding will be upon us shortly. During the budget resolution debate in March, I offered an amendment to increase VA's funding by \$2.8 billion for next year. I stood before this body and outlined the case for a significant increase for VA. But we were rejected because the administration claimed VA needed far less. Yet we are back to square one with regard to next year's funding.

Then, again, during the war supplemental debate in April—while VA remained silent as they were beginning to see warning signs—we were defeated in our efforts to secure more funding for this year. Again, this was because the administration failed to be forthcoming about the struggles that VA providers and patients were facing.

Hopefully, we all learned a clear lesson from this experience, that communicating with health care providers in the field and with the Veterans Service Organizations is invaluable. They told us what was really going on months ago.

I know my colleagues agree that we do not want to see this scenario repeat itself yet again. We have pressed this issue, and now we have another opportunity to finally fix the problem and fulfill our promise to this Nation's veterans. At the very least, this crisis has resulted in longer waiting times for care, hiring freezes, and delayed upgrading of medical equipment and facilities, to name a few.

This amendment is one way to fix the VA funding crisis. Providing \$1.5 billion in supplemental funding would ensure that each region of the country can get the funds needed to pull themselves out of the current crisis.

But I continue to be open to any approach that ensures the highest quality health care for our Nation's veterans. Along those lines, I appreciate the work that Senators CRAIG and HUTCHISON and our other colleagues are doing to tackle this problem. I believe we can find a solution, together.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEXUAL PREDATORS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is a poster that shows what I discovered on the Internet in North Dakota. I discovered this in the month of April. I was going to have a meeting in Fargo and, just out of curiosity, I called up the North Dakota registry of sex offenders, to find out who was living within 2 miles of where I was having the meeting, at city hall in Fargo, ND. In the briefing book I had, I described this fellow to the people who came. His name is Joseph Duncan. The entire country knows of Joseph Duncan now. When I described Mr. Duncan, many people in the area didn't know him.

This sheet from the North Dakota Attorney General's Office, Bureau of Criminal Investigation, shows that Joseph Duncan was living in Fargo, ND. He was a sexual predator, and he had served a 20-year prison sentence for a first-degree rape. In 1980, he raped a 14-year-old boy at gunpoint, burned the victim, and made the victim believe he was going to be killed by firing the gun twice on empty chambers. And he went to prison.

In 2000, he was released from prison. He completed his full sentence, and was released without probation or parole. He went to live in North Dakota.

Again, I mentioned him in April of this year at a meeting simply because his name came up on an inquiry I did about who was living in Fargo, ND.

What I didn't know in April, when I mentioned Mr. Duncan, was that 1 month earlier he had been charged with molesting a 6-year-old boy at a playground in Detroit Lakes, MN. He appeared in court April 5 on those charges, a county judge set the bail at \$15,000, and Joseph Duncan was released, promising to stay in touch. Of course, he didn't. He promptly disappeared.

As we know from substantial media coverage in recent weeks, Joseph Duncan was subsequently arrested in Idaho for kidnapping 8-year-old Shasta Groene. Her brother, 9-year-old Dylan, was missing. Their family was murdered upon the abduction of these two young children. The remains of Dylan have now been located. Duncan has been charged with abducting and molesting both children and is also under investigation for the murder of Dylan and the parents.

It is so frustrating to be here talking about this. It is a breakdown in common sense. Martha Stewart was let out of a minimum security prison and was required to wear an electronic bracelet and, apparently, she still wears one at her home under the disposition of the court. But we have known violent sexual predators walking around this country with no such level of supervision.

I have been on the Senate floor many times talking about a bill I introduced called Dru's law. I have shown colleagues a picture of a young woman named Dru Sjodin, who was brutally murdered and whose alleged assailant is a man named Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Rodriguez was in prison for 23 years. He is a violent sexual predator. He was let out, even when he was judged to be a high risk for reoffending. We know that 70 percent of the time high-risk sexual predators are going to reoffend. In most cases, their next offense will be more violent. Mr. Rodriguez allegedly murdered Dru Sjodin. The evidence is very substantial. He was walking around with not much more than a "see you later" at the prison door, much like Joseph Duncan. Mr. Duncan had been convicted previously of violent sexual offenses, and then he was accused in April of

molesting a 6-year-old boy. What happens to him? He goes through a revolving door in the criminal justice system to be let out at \$15,000 bail. Martha Stewart is wearing that bracelet and this fellow is turned back out on \$15,000. Then this young girl named Shasta Groene is kidnapped with her brother Dylan and they were sexually molested. People are dead.

Dru's law, which I introduced well over a year ago, has been passed by the Senate once and didn't get through the House. Senator SPECTER and I and others have introduced it again, and my hope is very much that in the month of July we can get it through this Chamber and through the House and get it to the President for signature. It has three simple provisions: One, there should be a national registry of sex offenders, a national registry of sexual predators. This isn't rocket science. Somebody like this who rapes a 16-year-old boy at gunpoint needs to go on a sexual predator registry, and no matter where this person showed up in the criminal justice system, regardless of state lines, the public should be able to know that he is out there. We need a national registry of sexual predators.

Two, before a high-risk sexual predator is about to be released from prison, the local State's attorney must be notified in the event that they believe this person is so dangerous that they need to seek additional civil commitment. That must be the case.

And three, if, in fact, a high-risk sexual predator is released at the end of his term, there must be intensive monitoring by local governments. Once again, electronic monitoring bracelets are not just meant for Martha Stewart. They ought to be meant for very violent offenders like this who abduct and brutalize young children at gunpoint.

We can do much better. It is not only about Dylan and Shasta and Dru Sjodin; month after month, we read these stories.

Jessica Lunsford, 9 years old, Mark Lunsford's daughter, was abducted in February from her bedroom in her Florida home, and they found her body a month later. The crime was committed by a 46-year-old convicted sex offender with a 30-year history.

We know who these people are. They have been in the system before.

Sarah Michelle Lunde disappeared April 9 in Ruskin, south of Tampa, FL. David Onstott, a convicted sex offender who once had a relationship with the girl's mother, has confessed to killing her.

Jetseta Gage, of Cedar Rapids, IA, was abducted, sexually assaulted, and murdered. Roger Paul Bentley has been arrested for that crime. He is a convicted sex offender on Iowa's sex offender registry.

This has to stop. We know who these people are. Statistics tell us that over 70 percent of the violent sexual predators, when let out of prison, are going to reoffend. I am talking about type 3 sex offenders, judged to be at highest

risk, as Mr. Rodriguez was when he was let out of prison and then within 6 months allegedly murdered Dru Sjodin.

When psychologists and psychiatrists evaluate sexual predators to be the highest risk, we cannot any longer say goodbye, so long, good luck at the prison door. We cannot let that happen again. We have to begin protecting innocent people. There are too many children whose lives are being lost.

Again, this is not rocket science. We know what is happening here, and we know how to stop it. Mark Lunsford wrote to me after his daughter was murdered. He said:

If my daughter's death is going to have any meaning, it will be through your efforts strengthening existing laws, by making our streets safe for all children. My heart continues to break as I mourn the loss of my beautiful little girl. I do not want other families to suffer as mine has, and I believe your efforts will go far toward that important goal.

My hope is that Senator SPECTER and many others who have cosponsored this bill that I have introduced will help to pass Dru's Law once again through the Senate, and then work hard to get it through the House and to the President's desk for signature. It is long past the time this country has a national registry of sexual predators, violent sexual predators who all too often are getting away with murder.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

DEATH OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ERIC PAUL WOODS

Mr. HAGEL, Mr. President, I rise to express my sympathy over the loss of Eric Paul Woods of Omaha, NE, a Private First Class medic in the U.S. Army. Private First Class Woods was killed by an explosion after stopping to save a wounded soldier on July 9 near Tal Afar in Iraq. He was 26 years old.

Private First Class Woods grew up in Urbandale, IA, and graduated from Urbandale High School in 1997. He moved to Omaha 5 years ago, joined the U.S. Army in April 2004 and was deployed to Iraq on March 8, 2005. Private First Class Woods was a member of G Troop, 2nd Squadron of the 3rd Army Cavalry, headquartered at Fort Carson, CO. Private First Class Woods will be remembered as a loyal soldier who had a strong sense of duty, honor, and love of country. Thousands of brave Americans like Private First Class Woods are currently serving in Iraq.

Private First Class Woods is survived by his wife, Jamie, and their 3-year-old son, Eric Scott, of Omaha, and his parents Charles and Jan Woods of Urbandale, IA. Our thoughts and prayers are with them at this difficult time. America is proud of Private First Class Woods' heroic service and mourns his loss.

I ask my colleagues to join me and all Americans in honoring PFC Eric Paul Woods.